

S 2554

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1967

cellent editorial endorsing the truth-in-lending bill, which I and 22 cosponsors introduced on January 11. The Journal believes that the average person faced with a bewildering array of credit plans may find himself baffled and unable to make an informed choice of the best terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRUTH IN LENDING

Wisconsin Sen. Proxmire thinks there is a good chance that a "strong and practical" truth in lending bill will be reported favorably this spring by the senate banking and currency committee, on which he is the No. 2 Democrat.

This cause was a major concern of former Sen. Douglas of Illinois, defeated for reelection last fall. The bill was pigeonholed in the last congress. Now Proxmire is carrying on the crusade. The bill would require full disclosure of the cost of credit so that the borrower knows precisely what he is paying in interest. It would not regulate interest charges.

Faced in the market place by a bewildering array of credit plans—installment buying, home mortgages, small loans, department store revolving charge accounts—the consumer may find himself baffled, unable to make an informed choice of the best terms.

The bill got a brief but sturdy assist from President Johnson in his state of the Union message: "We should do more to protect the consumer, he said. 'We should demand that the cost of credit be clearly and honestly expressed. Indeed we should.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 90 to S. 1, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TRINING] be added to the list of cosponsors.

Inadvertently, their names were left off the first printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, S. 612

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be added as cosponsors at the next printing of the bill (S. 612) to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A CALM APPRAISAL OF CIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my feeling that, in arriving at the true facts, and not being overwhelmed by the excitement which has been generated in the public arena by the revelation that the CIA has assisted in financially supporting the National Student Association, two very

important factors should be emphasized. One is that the Communists have subsidized virtually every kind of world student convocation in order to pack these supposedly open discussions with their own people. To combat this, the CIA attempted to provide the means whereby our country could secure dependable information concerning the student activities and perhaps counteract Communist forces working through the student congresses.

Second, there has been no claim that the CIA attempted to influence the activities of the student organizations or hinder them in their freedom of speech or ideas.

It is good that the President has ordered a review of such CIA activities. So, while we should not, at the moment, exculpate the agency, we should also be willing to wait until all the evidence is in before we automatically convict the CIA of wrongdoing.

Similar views have been expressed in newspaper editorials and articles here in Washington, D.C. These include the February 19 editorial, "What Are We Trying To Do to the CIA?", published in the Sunday Star; the article written by Crosby S. Noyes, "CIA Flap Hardly as Shocking as All That," in the February 21 issue of the Evening Star; and the article written by David Lawrence, "The CIA Issue, In Simplest Form" appearing in the same issue of the Evening Star.

I ask unanimous consent that these newspaper items be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Feb. 19, 1967]

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

It is just possible, if we all manage to work ourselves into a wild enough lather, that the current flap over the CIA can be escalated to the point where it will destroy the nation's intelligence organization. It almost seems that this is what some of the breast-beaters would like to do.

One day we have a disclosure that a student organization has been receiving covert funds so that young Americans can compete with young Communists at world student meetings. Then, suddenly, nothing will do but that every traceable operation of the CIA must be laid bare to public view, commented upon in tones of pious horror, investigated, sermonized, deplored and punished, until the terrible guilt of it all has been established for all time, for all the world to see.

And what, precisely, are we guilty of? Why, of using our wits and available means to compete in a battle just as real, dirty and deadly serious as any shooting war in which we could engage.

Confronted by adversaries who threw the full power and wealth of the state into the effort to mold and control world opinion, we did not abandon the field to them. Instead, we devoted some public funds to seeing to it that Americans could confront the totalitarians in the intellectual lists abroad, speaking their minds in representing the views of a relatively free society.

It worked, incidentally. A wide variety of Americans, most of whom never knew the source of the funds backing them, proved more than able over the years to hold their own in confrontation with disciplined, professional Communist agents. They pre-

vented the takeover of numerous international organizations and established others which have contributed substantially to the global cause of freedom.

Consider, for example, the experience of Gloria Steinem, as interestingly reported in yesterday's Washington Post. A New York writer, Miss Steinem was director of something called "The Independent Research Service," which took CIA money to send several hundred young Americans to World Youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1969 and 1962.

Miss Steinem said she worked closely with CIA agents on the program, but that few of the students who took those trips knew that the CIA was picking up the tab.

"I never felt I was being dictated to at all," she said. "I found them (the CIA men with whom she worked) liberal and far-sighted and open to an exchange of ideas. . . . They wanted to do what we wanted to do—present a healthy, diverse view of the United States."

She was backed up by Dennis Shaul, another spokesman for the organization, who said: "We had Minnesota schoolteachers who were further right than Bill Buckley as well as members of Students for a Democratic Society. Nobody told them what to do."

Bear in mind, except for such American participation financed by CIA funds, these festivals were completely dominated by Communists, all financed and controlled by their governments. Yet says Shaul, "The Helsinki festival was a disaster from their point of view, and I think we can take a good deal of credit for that."

Well now, why not? Is this really something that has to be apologized for? Who is corrupted by such an operation? Who would have paid the Americans' expenses if the CIA hadn't?

"The CIA," says Miss Steinem, "was the only (organization) with enough guts and foresight to see that youth and student affairs were important." And here, the lady puts her finger on an important point.

Of course, it would have been better if this sort of thing could have been done without subterfuge. It is too bad that private funds were not available for these purposes. It would have been healthier, lacking such private sources, for our government to have appropriated openly the necessary monies through the State Department, U.S. Information Agency or some other "respectable" organization. Even though no such alternative may have been available when these programs were initiated in the early 1950s, it would have been advisable to switch them away from CIA support as soon as that became possible.

No one, moreover, can possibly defend all the details of any one of these operations. No doubt there have been messy procedures which, when exposed, prove embarrassing. There is, one inevitably recalls, a saying about making omelettes and breaking eggs.

What is beyond comprehension in all this, however, is the monumental naivete involved in the apparent shock reaction to these disclosures on the part of otherwise knowledgeable people. After all, what have the outraged gentlemen supposed was going on all this time on the sprawling acres out at Langley? Of all the endeavors of the CIA, the effort to create outlets abroad for the expression of American opinion must surely rank as one of the milder. This is not, be it noted, a tea party that we have been engaged in. This is a viciously contested undercover war against shrewd, dedicated enemies who happen to be quite unhampered by nice-Nellie scruples. The need to press this fight has all along been recognized by the top leadership of the country. The procedures that suddenly evoke such outraged reactions were not dreamed up privately by the CIA. They were directed from the top, and properly so.

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S2555

The idea that an organization like the CIA can conduct its operations while restrained by a sort of daisy-chain of clergymen, den mothers and liberal politicians—such a notion is simply absurd. For our part, we hope that the present hysteria will be calmed with a rational inquiry conducted by responsible and realistic men who have some knowledge of the very serious problems involved. We are inclined to suspect that they and the public will end up concluding that the world has not, after all, ended—and that, in doing a job which had to be done, our intelligence organization has not done too badly.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1967]

CIA FLAP HARDLY AS SHOCKING AS ALL THAT
(By Crosby S. Noyes)

It's a curious thing about the Central Intelligence Agency. For a bunch of professional rascals, they have a remarkable tendency to come unhinged in times of stress.

Let the CIA blow one and everybody from the President on down suddenly loses his cool and starts acting like a kid caught with his hand in the cookie jar. And just about everything that is said by way of explanation or justification make the situation that much worse.

The present flap is no exception. The excuses made by the State Department on behalf of the CIA of why it was necessary to slip several million dollars to the National Students Association amounts to something of a masterpiece of gratuitous self-incrimination.

Consider, for instance, the official explanation of the need for secrecy as opposed to open government support of the student organization. According to the department's spokesman, "Overt governmental support of these NSA activities abroad would have destroyed their utility because NSA would hence have been subjected to attacks as an instrument of the government."

On the face of it, this statement makes little sense, since NSA in fact did receive open support from a number of government agencies, including the Agency for International Development, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the State Department. And it is quite clear that if the association survives at all, a good deal more of the same sort of open support will have to be forthcoming.

It also, however, manages to put the worst possible interpretation on the original arrangement. For if NSA would have been denounced as an agent of the government under a system of open support, what can be expected now that the source of its secret funds has been revealed? It is almost as if CIA, once the usefulness of NSA had been compromised, was stepping forward with the traditional dose of cyanide.

This is exactly the kind of "explanation" that is guaranteed to generate the absolute maximum reaction of outraged innocence at home and wondering disbelief over the naivete of Americans abroad. When it comes to anything having to do with the CIA, the American politician has an almost limitless capacity for righteous indignation. And to judge from the screams from Capitol Hill about the "threat to free American institutions" the storm will not blow over quickly.

While it lasts, the serious problems will probably not get much attention. The fact that the Communists are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to capture and control student organizations all over the world apparently makes little impression on our indignant legislators. Quite apart from the question of subsidizing students, the whole idea of propaganda and intelligence gathering offends the sensibilities of the simon-pure idealists.

It may be that the original decision to subsidize NSA with secret funds was as stupid, immoral and preposterous as everyone is now saying it was. Yet it remains to be explained why an arrangement that made sense over a period of 15 years to responsible officials in the administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, a Senate committee and four successive directors of the CIA should suddenly be the object of such horrified denunciation.

It is also at least questionable that the purity of our youngsters has been permanently and irreparably defiled by the support which they have received from any agency of the American government.

The CIA is, after all, on our side of the ballgame, whatever the editors of Ramparts magazine may think. Student organizations everywhere make promising targets for subversion. And an effort to have them promote American interests is hardly as shocking as all that.

At least not outside of the United States. The one thing that we can be sure of is that these sensational revelations will cause little amazement among our friends abroad who have long since stopped thinking of us as a nation of boy scouts. So far as they are concerned, the long arm of CIA is assumed to be behind almost every unexpected happening on the international scene. In this case, the only wonderment may be that the rich Americans have been so niggardly compared to the Russians in footing the students' bills.

THE CIA ISSUE, IN SIMPLEST FORM (By David Lawrence)

Many people throughout the United States are reading derogatory criticism or seeing cynical cartoons about the methods of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Few persons, however, know what the gathering of "intelligence" really means to the future of the nation itself.

To take an example, if an enemy country possesses nuclear weapons that could result in the sudden destruction of 130 million Americans, wouldn't it be worthwhile to get the facts and bring them to the attention of the military authorities in our own country so that countermeasures could be taken to prepare a defense system which would act as a deterrent against the carrying out of any such lethal plan?

Today America is in grave danger of potential attack by the Russians. Within the last year, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff learned through intelligence channels that the Russians had started to build antimissile defenses around Moscow, Leningrad and other key population centers at the rate of half-a-dozen each year.

The Russians, it turned out, had broken a pledge by ignoring the moratorium on nuclear explosions as they made some tests in 1961 and 1962 which encouraged them to go further with the development of their weapons. These tests were the most extensive ever conducted and convinced the Soviet leaders that what is known as an "antimissile missile" was worth building at once. Some important facts about the situation now have come out into the open, and members of the Armed Services Committees in both houses of Congress are urging the Defense Department to begin counter-measures.

It was not until after news articles were published last autumn telling the story of the antimissile system which the Russians are building that the Defense Department itself confirmed the information. Congress now is confronted with the problem of spending \$30 billion, spread over the next few years, to build a defense system that could cut the total casualties in the United States in the event of war by at least 70 million lives.

It has just been published that 1952 was the year when the U.S. Central Intelligence

Agency began to subsidize some student organizations affiliated with the National Student Association. This correspondent recalls a conversation in London that same year with a British intelligence officer of high rank, who had been asked by the writer for an evaluation of intelligence systems of different countries in the world. The intelligence officer said:

"Your own intelligence work in the United States is in its infancy. It is going to take you 10 to 20 years to find out how to do the job effectively. It sometimes takes many years merely to establish lines of communication in certain parts of the world, and you Americans are just beginning. It will cost a good deal of money. But the job has to be done—and in secret."

It is, of course, as important to keep secret the mistakes sometimes made in intelligence work as it is to refrain from boasting about successes. Intelligence is a continuously secret operation. Yet a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is already proposing an open investigation of the CIA. This would indeed be a boon to the Russians.

What possible benefit, it will be asked, can come from lining up American student organizations? What do such groups know about war operations or preparations? They may know very little, but they can find out a great deal if they become intimate with the students of enemy countries who assemble in meetings in various parts of the world. Sometimes there are students of Communist countries who want to defect. Their parents may be engaged in military service. Students may gather scraps of information which, when pieced together with data obtained in some other way, begin to make a case for efforts in pursuit of further intelligence.

Anybody who joins in CIA activities has to be sworn to secrecy all his life. It is amazing that anybody in the National Student Association was so ill-advised as to make public what his own government is doing.

Gathering intelligence is as important as fighting at the battlefield. In its simplest form, the issue is whether the United States should keep up-to-date in collecting vital information to defend itself or take chances while an irresponsible enemy builds up its power to blackmail the other nations of the world.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, February 24, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1967:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Alfred Robert Zipf, of California, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1970.

Dr. Kathryn M. Smith, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1970.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration: